

## Responsible NLP Checklist

Paper title: *Enhancing Large Vision-Language Models with Ultra-Detailed Image Caption Generation*  
Authors: Yu Zeng, Yukun Qi, Yiming Zhao, Xikun Bao, Lin Chen, Zehui Chen, Shiting Huang, Jie Zhao, Feng Zhao

How to read the checklist symbols:

- the authors responded 'yes'
- the authors responded 'no'
- the authors indicated that the question does not apply to their work
- the authors did not respond to the checkbox question

For background on the checklist and guidance provided to the authors, see the [Responsible NLP Checklist](#) page at ACL Rolling Review.

---

### A. Questions mandatory for all submissions.

#### A1. Did you describe the limitations of your work?

*This paper has a Limitations section.*

#### A2. Did you discuss any potential risks of your work?

*The data pipeline proposed in this paper takes potential risks into consideration during its design. The dataset and evaluation methods do not contain any potential malicious or accidental harmful effects or usage, nor do they involve privacy issues.*

### B. Did you use or create scientific artifacts? (e.g. code, datasets, models)

#### B1. Did you cite the creators of artifacts you used?

*In Reference of the paper, we list in detail the authors of all artifacts used and provide corresponding citations.*

#### B2. Did you discuss the license or terms for use and/or distribution of any artifacts?

*The license information of the artifacts we used is publicly available in their respective repositories, and we follow common academic citation practices.*

#### B3. Did you discuss if your use of existing artifact(s) was consistent with their intended use, provided that it was specified? For the artifacts you create, do you specify intended use and whether that is compatible with the original access conditions (in particular, derivatives of data accessed for research purposes should not be used outside of research contexts)?

*In Sec. 3 and Sec. 4 we discuss whether the use of existing artifacts is consistent with their intended purpose and explain the intended use of the artifacts we create.*

#### B4. Did you discuss the steps taken to check whether the data that was collected/used contains any information that names or uniquely identifies individual people or offensive content, and the steps taken to protect/anonymize it?

*Our dataset has been processed to ensure that it does not contain any personally identifiable information or offensive content.*

#### B5. Did you provide documentation of the artifacts, e.g., coverage of domains, languages, and linguistic phenomena, demographic groups represented, etc.?

*The Responsible NLP Checklist used at ACL Rolling Review is adopted from NAACL 2022, with the addition of ACL 2023 question on AI writing assistance and further refinements based on ARR practice.*

*Sec. 3 and Sec. 4 provide documentation of the artifacts, including coverage of domains, number of data, etc.*

- B6. Did you report relevant statistics like the number of examples, details of train/test/dev splits, etc. for the data that you used/created?

*Sec. 3 and Sec. 4 reports statistics about the data we use and create.*

**C. Did you run computational experiments?**

- C1. Did you report the number of parameters in the models used, the total computational budget (e.g., GPU hours), and computing infrastructure used?

*In Sec. B*

- C2. Did you discuss the experimental setup, including hyperparameter search and best-found hyperparameter values?

*In Sec. B*

- C3. Did you report descriptive statistics about your results (e.g., error bars around results, summary statistics from sets of experiments), and is it transparent whether you are reporting the max, mean, etc. or just a single run?

*(left blank)*

- C4. If you used existing packages (e.g., for preprocessing, for normalization, or for evaluation, such as NLTK, SpaCy, ROUGE, etc.), did you report the implementation, model, and parameter settings used?

*The use of software packages is standardized and does not require special instructions.*

**D. Did you use human annotators (e.g., crowdworkers) or research with human subjects?**

- D1. Did you report the full text of instructions given to participants, including e.g., screenshots, disclaimers of any risks to participants or annotators, etc.?

*The instructions given to participants were not explicitly detailed in the document, but general guidelines were followed.*

- D2. Did you report information about how you recruited (e.g., crowdsourcing platform, students) and paid participants, and discuss if such payment is adequate given the participants' demographic (e.g., country of residence)?

*The recruitment process and payment information were not disclosed due to privacy concerns.*

- D3. Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you're using/curating (e.g., did your instructions explain how the data would be used)?

*(left blank)*

- D4. Was the data collection protocol approved (or determined exempt) by an ethics review board?

*(left blank)*

- D5. Did you report the basic demographic and geographic characteristics of the annotator population that is the source of the data?

*Due to privacy or data protection reasons, the characteristics of the annotators have not been disclosed.*

**E. Did you use AI assistants (e.g., ChatGPT, Copilot) in your research, coding, or writing?**

- E1. If you used AI assistants, did you include information about their use?

*(left blank)*